

FEDERICO RODRIGUEZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Defendants.

)
)
) Case No: 2:15-cv-02507-JCM-PAL
)
) **UNNOPOSED MOTION TO**
) **EXTEND TIME**
)
) (First Request)
)
)
)

Pursuant to Local Rules 6-1 and 6-2, Federal Defendant submits this unopposed motion for a 90-day extension of time to file an answer or otherwise respond to the complaint.¹ (ECF No. 3). Based on the date of service of the summons and complaint on the United States attorney, the answer or other response is currently due by April 26, 2016. With the extension, the deadline to answer or otherwise respond will be July 25, 2016.

In support of the request, Federal Defendant states that it has conferred with Plaintiff's counsel regarding the need for additional time to fully evaluate the allegations in the complaint and to obtain

¹ Plaintiff's complaint was filed *pro se*. Nevertheless, Plaintiff has retained counsel, who is in the process of submitting the necessary paperwork to appear *pro hac vice*. Plaintiff's counsel has indicated that he has no opposition to the requested extension or the reasons provided in support thereof.

In addition, counsel for Federal Defendant has conferred with counsel for proposed Intervenor, Sussex Insurance Company f/k/a Companion Property Insurance Company, who has also indicated his non-opposition to the request.

1 additional information to determine whether early resolution is possible. All parties are working
2 collaboratively to exchange information, including pertinent medical records, and will continue to do so.
3 The parties believe that continued settlement evaluation is the most efficient use of their resources at this
4 time, and will substantially assist in expediting the litigation in the event early settlement is not
5 attainable. The parties will seek court approval for any discovery under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d) should the
6 need arise. It is not anticipated that more than the 90 days requested will be needed to conduct the
7 necessary evaluation and good faith settlement discussions.

8 **WHEREFORE**, Federal Defendant respectfully requests that this unopposed motion be granted
9 and the answer or other response be made due by **July 25, 2016**.

10 Respectfully submitted this 22st day of April 2016.

11
12 DANIEL G. BOGDEN
United States Attorney

13 /s/ Mark E. Woolf
14 MARK E. WOOLF
15 LINDSY M. ROBERTS
Assistant United States Attorneys
16 *Attorneys for the United States*

17
18 **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

19
20 
21 PEGGY A. LEEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22 DATED: April 25, 2016
23
24
25
26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Mark E. Woolf, certify that the following individual was served with a copy of the **UNOPPOSED MOTION TO EXTEND TIME** on the date and via the method of service identified below:

MAIL:

Ralph M. Rios, Esq.
Rios & Associates
1499 Huntington Drive, Suite 506
South Pasadena, CA 91030
Attorney for Plaintiff

Federico Rodriquez
1499 Huntington Drive, Suite 506
South Pasadena, CA 91030
Plaintiff

CM/ECF AND MAIL:

Brendan K. Ozanne, *Pro Hac Vice*
David A. Velijovich
Dawson & Ozanne
5927 Balfour Court Suite 202
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Counsel for Proposed Intervenor

Clark V. Vellis
Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Wray, Puzey & Thompson
800 South Meadows Parkway, Suite 800
Reno, NV 89521
Local Counsel for Proposed Intervenor

Dated this 22nd day of April 2016.

/s/ Mark E. Woolf
MARK E. WOOLF
LINDSY M. ROBERTS
Assistant United States Attorneys
Attorneys for the United States